

1996

The importance of multi-sourced leadership in a post-international global order

Elizabeth MacKenzie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

MacKenzie, Elizabeth, "The importance of multi-sourced leadership in a post-international global order" (1996). *Honors Theses*. 1225.
<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1225>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

**The Importance of Multi-Sourced
Leadership in a Post-International Global Order**

by

Elizabeth MacKenzie

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

April, 1996

The Importance of Multi-Sourced Leadership in a Post-International Global Order

by Elizabeth MacKenzie

Jepson School of Leadership Studies Senior Project
Dr. Ciulla
April 15, 1996

The Importance of Multi-Sourced Leadership in a Post-International Global Order

"In our present state of affairs, the very survival of mankind depends on people developing concern for the whole of humanity, not just their own community or nation"

- The Dalai Lama, 1993

We have come to a point in time when the problems in the world such as environmental degradation, human rights, overpopulation, and ethnic strife seem more difficult to solve than ever before. While it is possible that this is because the problems are more complex and require solutions beyond current human comprehension, it is more likely that we have been looking to the wrong institutions to solve our problems. However, we are in the midst of change. A paradigm may be shifting. Human beings around the world are gradually moving away from completely relying on sovereign state actors to address their problems to a system of participation with a multitude of leadership sources.

The primary problem in comprehending satisfactory, holistic solutions for the world's seemingly overwhelming impending crises is a function of the paradigm from which the majority of the world's people are viewing the problem. What if we were to construct a new lens based on new sources that emerge to address specialized issues? This is the lens created in a post-international global order with multi-sourced leadership. We are currently in a transition stage between the realist paradigm based on state-centric leadership and a post-international global order based on a multitude of sources of leadership.

The Commission on Global Governance, which included citizens from many nations, was

convened in 1995 and produced a report on the growing potential for 'global governance' in which new actors emerge as leaders to do work in areas that governments aren't. While the United Nations works to address global crises, the U.N., since it is bound by the sovereignty of the member-states, is often incapable of implementing solutions to interdependent problems. Transnational companies, NGOs, and other international affiliations are becoming organizational leaders in a new global civil society that have ideas and values that are defying national boundaries and leading a new global order. Transformational leadership within these organizations has never been more vital as the world is in the midst of great change in which a global ethic is emerging and needs to be defined.

Decline in the Power of the State

Throughout much of history, maximizing one's own nation's security has been the underlying motive for all interactions between nations. In 1948, Hans Morgenthau coined this the 'realist' paradigm. The main actor in the realist paradigm of international relations is the government of the nation-state. Power is the ultimate end in realism; just enough to defend one's own borders.¹

This structure for international relations is based on the Treaty of Westphalia. This peace treaty, signed at the end of the Thirty Year War in 1648, established the sovereignty of the nation-state. Security is the highest priority for the nation-state under the Westphalian system, and each particular government has its own security strategies.² However, as the world becomes more interdependent, nations have more at stake with other nations than simply vital interests or territorial integrity. Yet in our current system, governmental leaders have only the ability to act on

those things that can be understood to be in the interest of the nation-state. This paradigm can be seen in operation during the formulation of the U.S. policy decision to push Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, and his military, out of Kuwait. U.S. access to Kuwait's oil resources would have been threatened if Hussein gained control, and since oil is a vital interest of the United States, the decision to use military force was made.

After World War I, because of the devastation caused by the destructive warfare, as well as the scale of the war involving so many countries, the victors, especially U.S. president Woodrow Wilson, wanted to create an institution to prevent future war of that kind. The League of Nations Covenant was drawn up to create such an organization. Former alliances had created 'balance of power' situations, but the League was intended to create a "community of power," based on cooperation. However, the League Covenant provided only a framework, with only the slightest commitment from the necessary actors to make it succeed.³ Most dramatically, the United States Congress did not vote in favor of the United States becoming a member of the League. The Covenant failed to prevent war, as was seen by the onset of World War II. Following the war, the decision was made, once again, to create an international institution aimed at addressing issues of peace, war, human rights, etc. The UN charter was created, and this time the structure was different. However, the United Nations was still bound to the sovereign states who were members.

Gradually the UN has accumulated more responsibilities than just preventing war including peacemaking, election monitoring, human rights, and environmental issues. Especially following the Cold War, both the scope and speed of UN activities have changed. The number of countries and situations requiring peacekeepers has gone from 10,000 in 1987 to 72,000 in 1994.⁴ The

United Nations does not have supra-nation status to enforce the covenants, orders, or principles it espouses. Nations can choose whether or not to participate. At times when the majority of powers place their faith in the United Nations, the UN has been able to perform, but this can vary from president to president, prime minister to prime minister. The United Nations is being asked to address issues that member countries have contradictory opinions on. This does not leave the United Nations able to enforce any set of principles. In addition, funding for the United Nations operations comes directly from the budgets of the member nations. Ultimately, the power is still in the hands of the individual nation-state members. In a paradigm founded on state sovereignty, the UN does not have the sovereignty to always be an effective leader on global issues.

International Affairs professor James Rosenau has demonstrated that a new 'post-international' paradigm is beginning to emerge that shows that modern day global life is not only made up of relationships between nations. In a post-internationalist paradigm, the multi-sources of leadership are the state, along with SFAs (sovereignty-free actors). The number and types of SFAs are a result of the population explosion, as well as the increased desire of many people to identify with several groups; including womens' organizations, professional societies, and ethnic groups. Increased affiliation with these types of groups is also a function of the growing injustice in the disparity of levels of development between the first and third world.

Throughout the Cold War, though it was masked by the focus on the power struggle between the great powers, a transformation was occurring in the lives of many of the world's people. As interdependence between countries grew, especially economical interdependence, interest in world affairs grew among much of the world's population. Information about the affairs of other countries became available worldwide. This decreased governments' ability to impose its

will and set of values on the entire population. As a result, the absolute authority and legitimacy of states' power began to come into question.⁵

Rosenau has studied the two paradigms of world order, both realist and post-internationalist, and has created a table to help illustrate the different characteristics of the two. (Table 1) Note that while the locus of leadership in the realist paradigm is state-centric, with the majority of resources in the hands of powerful countries, the post-internationalist multi-centric world is led by 'innovative actors with extensive resources.'⁶ States no longer govern the flow of people, money, information, or goods in or out of their country. In addition, the decreased need for excessive military strength among the first world powers is fostering the distribution of power to different actors including trade unions, religious groups, social causes.

As a result, power has begun to shift from the hands of sovereign governments to sovereignty-free organizations such as transnational corporations, non-governmental organizations, and religious affiliations who can address the issues which concern humans most and transcend national interest. Like Rosenau, Richard Falk writes on this concept. He characterizes it as the shift from modernism to postmodernism.⁷ Modernism was characterized by the reliance upon technology to solve the dilemmas of human beings, however a postmodernist world view recognizes the limitations implicit with reliance upon technology and also recognizes the human being's need to view the world in a way that gives that person's life purpose. Falk believes this spiritual awakening is occurring at the same time that "the state is increasingly unable to satisfy the needs of individuals. [this] is a social fact of prime importance for our time."⁸ Falk finds optimism in the postmodernist possibility that would seek to find the commonalities of cultures through common interests such as preservation of the planet, human rights, etc. He

TABLE 1

Postinternationalism

TABLE 3.2 Structure and Process in the Two Worlds of World Politics

	<i>State-centric World</i>	<i>Multi-centric World</i>
Number of essential actors	Fewer than 200	Hundreds of thousands
Prime dilemma of actors	Security	Autonomy
Principal goals of actors	Preservation of territorial integrity and physical security	Increase in world market shares and maintenance of integration of subsystems
Ultimate resort for realizing goals	Armed force	Withholding of cooperation or compliance
Normative priorities	Processes, especially those that preserve sovereignty and the rule of law	Outcomes, especially those that expand human rights, justice, and wealth
Modes of collaboration	Formal alliances whenever possible	Temporary coalitions
Scope of agenda	Limited	Unlimited
Rules governing interactions among actors	Diplomatic practices	Ad hoc, situational
Distribution of power among actors	Hierarchical by amount of power	Relative equality as far as initiating action is concerned
Interaction patterns among actors	Symmetrical	Asymmetrical
Locus of leadership	Great powers	Innovative actors with extensive resources
Institutionalization	Well established	Emergent
Susceptibility to change	Relatively low	Relatively high
Control over outcomes	Concentrated	Diffused
Bases of decisional structures	Formal authority, law	Various types of authority, effective leadership

Source: James N. Rosenau, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 250.

believes the process through which common needs are recognized will help foster a democratic global civil society.⁹ In addition, as power is distributed across borders, the potential for a global civil society increases.¹⁰ As such, leaders of non-governmental organizations, transnational corporations, and social movements are in a unique position to educate various populations about the effect that they can have in areas very important to them.

Leadership and the Emergence of a new paradigm

"We must not forget that human agents are not mere cogs in structural machines, programmed to act only as their predecessors have acted for as far back in history as they can peer. Humans can demonstrate imaginative and courageous leadership and moral choice, even if the possibilities open to them in these respects are always somewhat limited by the historical and social context of their time"¹¹

Without national borders to protect and separate people, individuals become more aware that their every move affects the other human beings on the planet. Hans-Henrik Holm identifies this phenomena as globalization. He defines it as the "intensification of economic, political, social, and cultural relations across borders."¹² And as the importance of the individual increases, as the importance of the state decreases. The state authority is no longer viewed as the representative of all of its citizens. New sources of power emerge when individuals work together collectively on establishing a common goal. in a multi-centric world, leadership is emerging from innovative actors with extensive resources. The process of leadership is one that solicits the voice of all people and calls on them to find their own voice and use it to influence the world around them. As the shift from sovereign state actors to multi-sourced actors begins, only people who embrace and embody change will be identified as leaders.

This type of leadership must represent a constituency that potentially could include all humans. "The direction that the world is going in the future may be strongly influenced by 'intelligent human action.'"¹³ New organizations with growing power and resources are the emerging global leaders through this paradigm shift. Enlightened leaders with an awareness of this 'big picture' understand that they have the ability to seek out the input of wide populations to create solutions to some of the globe's greater problems. Much like governmental leaders of countries, these organizational leaders have the ability to impact how individuals worldwide view themselves as human beings.

Because comprehensive solutions to the world's problems can only be truly found by seeking out input from those that are most affected, leaders of any transnational or transcultural organization must know to first listen and assess the situation in which they operate. Consensus decision-making is integral to real change, since ownership of the solution belongs to all those involved, and hence responsibility for implementation is distributed.¹⁴ Hence, transformational leadership is needed at this turning point in world history. This type of leadership inspires confidence in followers, educates them of their vital role in the process of change, and fosters their moral development.¹⁵

"Intellectual leaders are not detached from their social milieus; typically they seek to change it." James MacGregor Burns describes intellectual leadership as a specific type of transforming leadership. He emphasizes the intellectual leader's ability to 'pervasively influence' an entire society or time period's thinking and subsequently the actions of politicians. It is important to understand that this unusual ability to transform the thinking of a wide number of people emerges from a sense of conviction embraced by the intellectual leader. Burns identifies values as

the source of this conviction for the intellectual leader. He sees moral detachment as contradictory to the "concerns of the free mind."¹⁶Leading, by seeking to listen and empower the community of individuals affected by change, will elicit the most effective solutions and create the most sustainable vision. "The new political paradigm focuses on individual empowerment - helping people feel confident in themselves and their ability to affect the world, and giving them training and tools to be effective in achieving social goals."¹⁷

While the governments of many of the world's countries may not be empowering the people that live within their borders, leaders of transnational organizations are reaching these populations via telecommunications, the church, etc., and their messages are transcending the interests of the sovereign state. Recognition of our interconnectedness and the stake we have as one people is appealing to logical thinking in the minds of many across the world, hence fostering the global paradigm shift. As with any paradigm shift, a fundamental change in thinking, that is primarily intellectual, must occur at a mass level. This intellectual movement is occurring through a process of dispersed leadership from many sources. To be a leader through a paradigm shift and emerge with effectiveness at leading a new group with an ambiguous role, such as leaders in a transnational corporation with uncertain international regulations and little precedent for cross-cultural relations, OR an NGO with a vision that expands beyond the limitations of government to new concepts of political power and social systems.

The Importance of Moral Leadership

The Commission on Global Governance states that we have a "pooled sovereignty" with

newly realized responsibilities to one another. This is the reality that today's leaders face. The end of the Cold war has not produced stability or peace. The notion of realpolitik, and its emphasis on self-interest, is not the paradigm that will lead our globe into a sustainable existence. The importance of the moral development of current leaders, while the world is at this turning point, must be recognized. The changes in the power structures of global order suggest that an individual may have, more than in any time in the past, the power to affect the world community. There is an increased ability to relay messages and information to mass amounts of people.

With a sense of one's values, and their relationship to the various communities of the world, a leader can make his/her voice heard. The global economy, information technology, and easier travel is making the flow of ideas between people on different continents easier. Citizens of all countries no longer have to depend on their national governments to represent to their interests to other nations. People are able to relate and identify with people who share their values, interests, or concerns without respect to national boundary. And according to James MacGregor Burns, "at the highest stage of moral development are persons guided by near-universal ethical principles of justice such as equality of human rights and respect for individual dignity."¹⁸ This assumes that leaders, despite cultural difference, hold similar values after a process of self-actualization.

However, we must carefully examine the possibility that individuals with self-interested motives can use new knowledge of a culture's situation and manipulate it for his/her advantage. The power to influence is great; this can be both constructive or destructive. Never before have we needed the input of all the various populations to work to create solutions that are not unjust. This is why we must abandon any international relations structures that do not have a clear sense

of values. International actors must not merely be power-wielders, but leaders. The politics of the various nations and people of the earth cannot be understood by the use of brute power alone. There is a moral component to this kind of leadership in which leaders are needed to "release human potentials now locked in ungratified needs and crushed expectations."¹⁹

Source of order in a Post-internationalist paradigm: A Global Ethic

"That which is called God by the Christians, Jehovah by the Jews, Ultimate Reality by the Hindus, The Buddha mind by Buddhists, Allah, by Muslims, And which the Chinese call the Tao - That is the Real Self And is all-pervading.

At the current time, many human interactions across cultures and across countries are unregulated. Institutional covenants with ethical guidelines have attempted to establish a set of guidelines for international behavior. UN platforms for action on human rights, in including political and social rights, have done well to set a world-wide standard for both governmental and non-governmental leaders to strive for, but states' are slow to implement the UN suggestions in to national policy.²⁰ In addition, the 2nd Parliament of world religions met in 1993 to create a Global Ethic of Care for individuals of every religion to live by. Leaders from the Jewish, Zen, Buddhist, Jain, Zoroastrian, Vedanta, Confucian, and Muslim faiths engaged in a dialogue about the search for a common humanity, as they did one hundred years ago at the 1st Parliament on World Religions.²¹

This helped to begin the development of a global ethic, however rules will not govern ethical behavior. Leaders must foster the ethical development of his/her followers. Identifying and articulating the unconscious values of his/her followers is an important job of the leader.

Boundaries, overcome by media, travel, and telecommunication, are becoming very fluid are allowing the spiritualities of many cultures to intermix, and this is aiding the leader to create an understanding of the work that can be done together with leaders of different races, cultural traditions, and across national borders to address our 'globally interlocked' issues such as famine, the economy, education, and the environment.²² An example of this is the consensus reached by the Commission on Global Governance. The commission was made up of 28 leaders with diverse life experiences and backgrounds. The chairman of the Commission writes:

The members of the Commission are from many backgrounds and orientations. Yet, over the last two years, we have been united by one single desire; to develop a common vision of the way forward for the world in making the transition from the cold war and in managing humanity's journey into the 21st century. Everyone might not have fully embraced each and every proposal; but we all agreed on the overall substance and direction of the report. The strongest message we can convey is that humanity can agree on a better way to manage its affairs and give hope to present and future generations. The vision the commission embraced for this was global governance, in which a sustainable future can be assured by distributing responsibility to an international civil society as well as traditional sovereign states. The report concludes with a call for enlightened leadership at every level, based on a common set of values that recognize our interdependence.²³

In this time of transition between systems of governing, while it is possible an institution of governance will emerge eventually, leadership from various sectors of society will reign in the transition.²⁴ Sadly, we cannot always rely upon morality to guide leaders always. Plato argues in the Statesman that the rule of law is needed since leaders cannot always be relied upon for acting morally.²⁵ However, it is imperative in a period without laws governing the action and behaviors of the various new actors on the international scene to identify a common global ethic for

organizational leaders to feel responsible for upholding. Leaders must work to put their values into action, so that a precedent can be set upon which a new system of governance can emerge.

Since religion is a strong factor in the development of an individual's world view, the common values they share are important to understand the development of a global ethic. Religious leader Tu Wei Ming believes, "never before has there been such a need to find the common ground among religions as we all begin to see that humans may not be a viable species."²⁶ While often the cultural norms and traditions are different, many of the world's religions hold common values. Through trial and error, as well as after serious academic study, certain common values have been identified that are 'governing' world order. Scholars Hans-Henrik Holm and Georg Sorensen explain that "an international order built on ideas of justice, freedom, and peace has served as reference point for much of the debate on the new world order."

Sources of Leadership in a Post-Internationalist paradigm of World Order

"It is through a diversity of responses, suited to local and regional conditions, that the security of the planet will ultimately be assured. The task for international governance is not to micromanage these actions, which depend on the genius, commitment, and ingenuity of individuals worldwide, but to ensure that the climate is favorable for them." ²⁷

Non-Governmental Organizations

People from all across the world are affiliating with groups focused on issues that transcend their country's national interests. Often led by empowered individuals, these organizations mobilize large groups of people. The most recent examples of this can be found in

the less developed countries. "NGOs are at a crossroads. Never before have they been so powerful, not just in financial terms, but also in their credibility with decision makers at all levels."²⁸ NGOs are inherently able to be international, flexible, experimental, and reflective. They are able to bring together consensus from diverse populations. The opportunity exists for NGOs to continue to have a very significant impact, and armed with moral leadership, they can have transformative effects on the issues and situations they address. The increase in number of NGOs supports the idea that a global civil society is taking shape. However, the notion of a global civil society is relatively new. This is a challenge to the state-centered structure. Membership and participation in organizations that are non-governmental provides an alternative mechanism for decision-making.

"The key to a successful project is almost invariably its leadership." ²⁹Leadership within the NGO varies, however by virtue of the fact that they are not-for-profit, some generalizations can be made. Foremost, leaders of NGOs' are often committed to a vision that involves a type of social change. Their work is external and involves urging others to embrace the mission of the organization. To do this, they must 'transform' others to believe that a particular issue transcends the personal interests of that person.³⁰ However, a threat to this is that often NGOs' do not have the resources to formally develop leadership skills in its members. Considering the importance and criticalness of the issues being addressed by the NGOs, it is imperative that leadership not be undervalued.

NGOs that focus on development have a particularly crucial need for leadership in today's world. The third world is becoming increasingly dependent on the countries of the first world. The development initiatives of the last thirty years have not fostered sustainable development, but

have instead institutionalized the need for more assistance through ineffective project management.³¹ "A project, to be sustainable, must address problems and aspirations identified by the poor and must have a management and decision-making structure in which they have confidence."³² Oxfam officer John Clark notes that we are realizing that "countries are more efficient and prosperous where governments are guided by strong civil societies."³³

"If development organizations are to make meaningful contributions toward alleviating poverty, then they must learn to follow the people, not expect the people to follow them." NGOs from first world countries, when they partner with NGOs from third world countries, are building egalitarian relationships in which Third World citizens are proving that they know best about how to produce their own sustainability with the aid of first world NGOs. These new relationships are especially important because the world is facing crisis on a scale never before experienced. For one, awareness of the damage that humans are doing to our natural surroundings is sufficient to warrant action. "We cannot wait until the long-run environmental problems become issues of short-term survival. In addition, social disease, including the spread of AIDS, the use of drugs, and famine call for action. We need a new course and we need it today. Hence citizens pressure is essential. And non-governmental organizations have a crucial role to play."³⁴

An example of strong NGO leadership is the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC). Fazle Abed is the leader of this NGO which employs over 2,000 people. Graduates directly out of college are hired and offered a "moral contract," in which workers begin by doing field work to ground them in the reality of their work and the values of the people they will be serving.³⁵ The values held by global NGOs. The common global ethic... The most successful change is made when awareness is heightened and people feel empowered. This is the first step

toward ending the hegemony of a few select countries. As education increases among peoples in less developed countries, the potential for these countries to modernize without losing their cultural heritage increases. This can lead to a greater willingness to work with other cultures, since a particular country will not feel its own culture is threatened. Much of the fundamentalism in the Middle East, especially in Algeria, Egypt, Iran, and Bahrain is a backlash against Western notions of progress that have secularized their countries and disrupted the Muslim notion of community.³⁶

The Carter Center is a striking case study of a non-governmental organization that is doing significant work in areas formerly attempted by sovereign states or international governmental organizations. The Carter Center's mission is to "resolve conflicts peacefully and promote human rights." Because they are not aligned with any government or political party, they have increased freedom to affect change. Currently, the Carter Center staff is involved in programs in conflict resolution, human rights, global development, governance, and election monitoring. Former President Carter is a prime example of NGO leadership that is affecting change toward bettering the human condition. His work has helped foster dialogue with North Korea, eased tensions in the Baltics, cured disease in Sudan, and encouraged democracy and human rights worldwide.³⁷

Transnational and Multinational Corporations

Multinational corporations are becoming very influential actors in global leadership as they transport capital across national boundaries. A global economy has emerged that goes beyond

international trade, and isolated national economies are becoming extinct. A "consolidated global market place for production, distribution, and consumption" has developed.³⁸ MNCs such as General Motors, Royal Dutch/Shell, and Exxon each have total sales above the GDP's of countries such as South Africa, Saudi Arabia, and Argentina. However, unlike countries, these MNCs operate with few regulations acting on them.³⁹ The impact that MNCs can have on a widespread number of the world's people is immense. Ethicist Joanne Ciulla states, "Private enterprises are taking on greater responsibility for a variety of things. Their ethics are affecting others, and they are setting a standard of ethics."⁴⁰

MNCs are able to profit from sales in a particular country, but return none of the profits toward the development of that country's peoples. This can be an even greater problem if the MNC does not respect the culture in which it is operating and instead only operates from the owners' cultural viewpoint. Another concern is that the labor forces in third world countries can be easily exploited without laws regulating the MNC's behavior.⁴¹ This transcendence of borders also can potentially lead to the loss of cultural identity for some groups, especially those that do not have the wealth to prevent the influx of marketing from first world countries. The *Multinational Monitor* has emerged as the watchdog for irresponsible leadership of multinational companies. This group tracks corporate activity to report on a company's "export of hazardous substances, worker health and safety, labor union issues, and the environment."⁴²

However, the potential for positive action by MNCs is great, because of their resources and flexibility. They are able to conserve scarce land, share profits in host countries, and operate with innovative, fair labor practices. Businesses should find a way to do this that is economically beneficial, since currently socially conscious businesses are in the minority. Yet true commitment

to the values behind the socially conscious behavior will be required for lasting change.⁴³ The creation of the Business Council for Sustainable Development, which is made up of the fifty top executives from the world's largest corporations, and its preparation of sound environmental policies and practices for the Earth Summit is a good indicator of this commitment.⁴⁴

In addition, the leadership of Muhammad Yunus, founder of the Grameen Bank, is setting a precedent for the type of leadership needed to transform society, as well as be economically profitable. Yunus is a pioneer in the international micro-lending business who has succeeded in aiding indigenous women in beginning their own businesses through small scale loans. The bank is over twenty-five years old and has a perfect repayment rate. Women who receive the loans attend trainings on effective skills for entrepreneurship, and as such, these loans have transformed their lives. The Grameen bank has awarded over ten million loans worldwide, which has begun to lessen the foreign aid burden on first world governments. Also, within countries, the Grameen Bank concept, which has been copied by many newer bank programs, is reducing dependence on aid from the central government.⁴⁵

The Grotian Quest

"Change is one of the most complex and elusive phenomena in the study of historical causation," according to James MacGregor Burns.

Much like Hugo Grotius, who predicted the transition from federalism to sovereign state entities in the early 1600's, prior to the Westphalian Treaty, I see the shadow of a new world order based upon global communities of empowered individuals. Richard Falk believes too that

"this Grotian quest should probably concentrate on mobilizing the conscience of the people more than on activating the conscience of their rulers."⁴⁶ We have gotten away with narrow-minded thinking and unenlightened leadership in the past, because consequences were limited. We no longer have the luxury of isolation. Strife was limited to one region, but decisions made today affect all humans.

We now have a universal responsibility to one another, resulting from our mutual vulnerability. The source of solutions to many of the Earth's overwhelming problems is within each one of us and is dependent on our ability, as a majority of the human population, to look inward for guidance and seek the universal truth. Armed with this self-actualization, transformational leaders can serve as catalysts to unleash this potential for change.

1. James N. Rosenau and Mary Durfee, Thinking Theory Thoroughly: Coherent Approaches to an Incoherent World (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1995) 1.
2. Rosenau, Thinking Theory Thoroughly, 79.
3. Lyn Miller, Global Order: Values and Power in International Politics (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994) 75.
4. James N. Rosenau and Mary Durfee, Thinking Theory Thoroughly: Coherent Approaches to an Incoherent World (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1995) 110.
5. Rosenau, Thinking Theory Thoroughly, 39.
6. Rosenau, Thinking Theory Thoroughly, 41
7. Richard Falk, Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992) 37.
8. Richard Falk, Explorations at the Edge of Time, 123.
9. Richard Falk, Explorations at the Edge of Time, 24-51
10. Hans Henrik Holm and Georg Sorensen, Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995) 5.
11. Lyn Miller, Global Order, 54.
12. Hans-Henrik Holm and Georg Sorensen, Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995) 4.
13. Lynn Miller, Global Order: Values and Power in International Politics, (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994) 73.
14. McLaughlin, Spiritual Politics, 101
15. Corinne McLaughlin and Gordon Davidson, Spiritual Politics (New York: Ballantine Books, 1994) 99.
16. James MacGregor Burns, Leadership, (New York: Harper & Row, 1978) 142
17. McLaughlin, Spiritual Politics, 124
18. Burns, Leadership, 42
19. Burns, Leadership, 143

20. Lyn Miller, Global Order, 91
21. S. Tobias, Parliament of Souls (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) 3
22. Rushworth M. Kidder, Shared Values for a Troubled World: Conversations with Men and Women of Conscience (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1994) 16.
23. The report of the Commission on Global Governance, Our Global Neighborhood, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) 355.
24. Lyn Miller, Global Order, 89
25. Joanne Ciulla, "Informations and the Ethics of Business Leaders," 7
26. Bill Moyers, A World of Ideas II (New York: Doubleday, 1990) Tu Wei Ming interview.
27. Lester R. Brown, State of the World, 188.
28. Clark, 151.
29. John Clark, Democratizing Development, 83.
30. John Clark, Democratizing Development, 53.
31. Graham Hancock, Lords of Poverty: the power, prestige, and corruption of the international aid business (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1989) 41.
32. John Clark, Democratizing Development, 49.
33. John Clark, Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations, (West Hartford Connecticut: Kumarian Press, 1991) xii.
34. John Clark, Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations, (West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press, 1991) 10.
35. Clark, 83.
36. Richard Falk,
37. *Carter Center at a Glance*, Office of Public Information-The Carter Center, 1995
38. Hans Henrik Holm and Georg Sorenesen, Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995) 5.
39. Richard W. Mansbach, The Global Puzzle: Issues and Actors in World Politics (Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin, 1994) 151.

40. Kidder, Shared Values for a Troubled World, 45
41. Mansbach, The Global Puzzle, 153.
42. *Multinational Monitor online*, Essential Information, 1.
43. McLaughlin, Spiritual Politics, 383
44. Lester H. Brown, State of the World (New York: A Worldwatch Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society, 1995) 185.
45. Alex Counts, Give Us Credit, (New York: Random House, 1996) 35
46. Richard Falk, The End of World Order: Essays on Normative International Relations, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983) 32.